

**SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS  
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION  
INTERIM AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING ORDINANCE  
PROJECT NO. PRJ2020-000266**

**July 22, 2020 Regional Planning Commission Hearing**

At the public hearing on June 22, 2020, staff provided an overview of the Draft Ordinance. Staff presented the major elements and key components of the Draft Ordinance, including provisions to encourage the development of housing for people experiencing homelessness (shelters, transitional housing, and supportive housing), and to support temporary vehicle living. Staff also recommended revisions to the Draft Ordinance. One revision was recommended to address stakeholder concerns and to ensure access to services for shelter occupants. Another was to extend the duration of interim housing that is created through temporary motel conversions, based on stakeholder input. The remainder of the revisions were for clarification purposes or to ensure internal consistency.

Discussion

Four individuals testified at the hearing. One individual representing Save Our Rural Town expressed concerns about permitting mobilehome parks by right in the agricultural zones, and the simultaneous review of five pending housing ordinances. An individual representing the Three Points-Liebre Mountain Town Council and the Association of Rural Town Councils (ARTC) expressed health and safety concerns related to allowing temporary occupancy of recreational vehicles on lots with owner-occupied single-family residences in the residential and agricultural zones. The individual also expressed concerns about the deletion of maximum occupancy and concentration standards for shelters and how those changes would impact the Antelope Valley. One individual representing Shelter Partnership asserted that the Draft Ordinance should allow alternative shelter models, such as emergency sleeping cabins, membrane tents, and tiny homes, on privately-owned property; and allow shelters in single-family residences. Lastly, an individual representing the Acton Town Council (ATC) expressed concern about permitting mobilehome parks by right in the agricultural zones, and also commented that Acton had not had enough time to review the ordinance due to COVID-19.

Staff also provided the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) with five comment letters and three emails. Three of the letters and all emails were submitted by the ATC. They expressed concerns about allowing shelters and accessory shelters in Zones A-1 and A-2; revisions to development standards; health and safety concerns related to allowing temporary occupancy of recreational vehicles on lots with owner-occupied single-family residences in the residential and agricultural zones; and simultaneous review of five pending housing ordinances; and mirrored the sentiments expressed during the public

hearing. A letter submitted by the ARTC mirrored the concerns expressed during the public hearing. Lastly, a letter submitted by the Supportive Housing Alliance, expressed support for the Ordinance, and requested clarifications, the addition of language for consequences for not meeting the review time limits in the Draft Ordinance, and removal of the requirement for a supportive services plan from the covenant.

During the discussion, the RPC inquired about access to bathrooms for occupants of the different use types in the Draft Ordinance, including safe parking. Staff responded that all shelters, including accessory shelters, and transitional housing and supportive housing require bathrooms. Staff further clarified that for safe parking, the Draft Ordinance requires 1 bathroom for every 20 occupants.

The RPC asked about any consequences in the Draft Ordinance for not meeting the 60-day review timeline for Site Plan Review for shelters. Staff stated no, and cited the State shelter streamlining bill Assembly Bill (AB) 101, which also does not include such language. In addition, staff clarified that other applicable State laws have language with consequences for not meeting certain imposed milestones.

The RPC asked how much the transit proximity requirement for shelters limits the number of parcels eligible for the by-right review of shelters, and additionally asked for the definition of 'transit' in this context. Staff clarified that the transit proximity requirement for by-right shelter review is only for Zones A-1 and A-2, and that the definition of 'transit' includes all bus and rail stops.

The RPC asked why the Coastal Zone is excluded from the by-right shelter review for Zones A-1 and A-2, but not for other uses, such as motel conversions and safe parking. Staff responded that the intent was to plan for the Coastal Zone and other special management areas differently in order to direct new development toward established, urbanized communities, and away from natural resources and environmentally sensitive areas. Staff further clarified that motel conversions and safe parking are different in that they utilize existing buildings/sites.

The RPC inquired about the 20-year maximum for motel conversions and whether that may create unintended consequences related to displacing tenants of transitional housing. Staff responded that the 20-year maximum was created to prevent long-term conversion to shelters or transitional housing, where those uses are not currently permitted, and to encourage permanent conversion where those uses are permitted.

The RPC expressed concerns that the requirement for transitional housing and supportive housing units to be restricted to lower income households would prevent the development of units for extremely low income and very low income households. Additionally, the RPC expressed concerns about the requirements for supportive services in covenants being too rigid. Staff described the importance of flexibility for developers of transitional and supportive housing to ensure that projects are financially feasible. Staff further responded that the supportive services requirement was revised and included with staff's recommendations.

The RPC inquired about the possibility for additional outreach prior to the Board of Supervisors hearing, but also emphasized the urgency of the crisis as a factor in moving the Draft Ordinance forward.

The RPC asked whether prohibiting fees for safe parking would discourage large safe parking lots, and discussed whether large lots need additional development standards. Regarding fees, staff responded that a prohibition on fees should not prevent large safe parking lots because: large safe parking lots can be found in other jurisdictions, which restrict safe parking to government and nonprofit organizations; there is public funding for safe parking lots through the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, so there is no need to pass the cost onto the vehicle occupants; and charging a fee for safe parking would establish a “rent” for vehicle living, which is not consistent with State law relating to shelters (which asserts that people cannot be turned away for lack of ability to pay). Regarding additional standards for large safe parking lots, staff responded that the operational standards imposed by public funding provide examples of additional standards that could be added.

The RPC encouraged staff to further consider consequences for not reviewing shelters within the 60-day time limit imposed by the Draft Ordinance, as well as alternative models to ensure that the County is supporting innovative strategies to address homelessness.

The RPC closed the public hearing and voted unanimously to recommend approval of the Draft Ordinance, with revisions recommended by staff, to the Board of Supervisors.

### **August 5, 2020 Airport Land Use Commission Hearing**

At the public hearing on August 5, 2020, the Airport Land Use Commission found that the Draft Ordinance is consistent with the adopted Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan, General William J. Fox Airfield Land Use Compatibility Plan, and Brackett Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. There were no speakers or comments from the Commission.